



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/739,645	12/20/2000	Masahiro Komura	1341.1076 (JDH)	4243
21171	7590	03/27/2006	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			COLIN, CARL G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2136	

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/739,645

Applicant(s)

KOMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Carl Colin

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. In response to communications filed on 1/23/2006, applicant amends claim 10; the following claims 1-17 are presented for examination.

1.1 In response to communications filed on 1/23/2006 the objection to claim 10 has been withdrawn with respect to the amendment.

2. Applicant's arguments, pages 7-9, filed on 1/23/2006, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-17 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 1, Applicant argues that Torii does not disclose security information comprising information regarding design error or bug. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As indicated in the last Office Action, Torii discloses security information transmitting from the user terminal to the center comprises information regarding installation history of the software whether there was any problem during installation of the software, the center carries out the refund processing based on identification check and analysis on the installation history and determines whether the software installation is terminated abnormally to determine a cause of the failure (see columns 10-11 for more detailed explanation of the entire process). Torii further discloses security information transmitting from the user terminal to the center, the security information comprises installation history, content ID, access number, buying number, installation progress codes, start and termination codes, unique software check code, deciphering information, etc., to be checked by

Art Unit: 2136

the center to determine fraud (see summary of invention). Regarding claim 17, in response to Applicant's request to the Examiner to explain where and how Torii discloses a "security flaw", Examiner would like to clarify that the term "security flaw" added in claim 17 in the response filed on 6/30/2005 by applicant was interpreted by Examiner in light of the specification as discussed above as "security information regarding information regarding design error or bug" rather than a failure by applicant to comply with the written description requirement. In response to applicant's argument that Torii teaches a system that is less secure than Linehan, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Applicant has not overcome the rejection; therefore, it remains the Examiner's position that claims 1-17 remain rejected in view of the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to

Art Unit: 2136

which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.1 Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,327,578 to **Linehan** in view of US Patent 5,761,308 to **Torii et al.**

3.2 As per claims 1, 8, and 15-17, **Linehan** substantially teaches a security information connected between a first terminal at an information contributor and a second terminal at an information recipient, the security information mediation apparatus comprising: **Linehan** discloses registering information between a merchant and a bank that that meets the recitation of a first receiving unit which receives security information from the first terminal a first registering unit which registers the security information in a first database (column 4, lines 9-22); and discloses the bank transferring security information to a gateway service then to the consumer that meets the recitation of first transfer unit which receives the security information from the first registering unit and transfers the security information registered by the first registering unit to the second terminal for the information recipient to judge the usefulness of the security information (see column 4, lines 18-45); the issuer gateway receives information for validation that meets the recitation of a second receiving unit which receives at least reply information including the usefulness of the security information corresponding to the security information from the second terminal (column 4, lines 24-44); authorized information is sent to the merchant that meets the recitation of a second registering unit which registers at least the reply information in a second database and a second transfer unit which receives at least the

Art Unit: 2136

reply information from the second registering unit and transfers the reply information to the first terminal (column 4, lines 34-57) **Linehan** discloses the merchant receiving and verifying payment information including in an authorization token that meets the recitation of receiving and registering reply information with payment information wherein when the information recipient finds that the security information has usefulness the second receiving unit receives payment information on an information presentation fee to be paid to the information contributor from the second terminal the second registering unit registers the payment information together with the reply information and the second transfer unit transfers the payment information together with the reply information to the first terminal (column 6, lines 20-32). **Linehan** discloses the invention by way of example. It is obvious to one skilled in the art that any modification or variation such as the order of transmission of data and combining or separating the task into one or many apparatus would be a routine skill in the art and not a patentable invention but rather a design choice. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine the functions into one unit to save in resources or/and distribute some functions into many units to separately control the transaction so that if one unit is compromised the entire system is not. To shift location of parts requires routine skill in the art-*In re Japikse* 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950). Using first, second units and databases is a minor modification of the invention disclosed by **Linehan** and one skilled in the art would have been motivated to modify the invention disclosed to fit their design need. **Linehan** suggests different embodiments involving three, four or more parties. **Linehan** discloses a way of conducting secured transaction for doing business in electronic commerce. **Linehan** does not explicitly disclose that the secured transaction is relating to a design error or bug in a computer program. It is apparent that the

Art Unit: 2136

invention of **Linehan** can be applied to any Internet computer service that includes financial transaction. **Torii et al** in an analogous art discloses a user storing an installation history file (security information) comprising design error or bug or security flaw in a software, and sends the installation history file to a center (column 10, lines 24-65); the center comprising a registering unit (46), (see figures 6-7) which registers the security information in a database and other units (50) and (51) judge the usefulness of the security information and when it finds that the security information has usefulness, payment information is transferred to the first terminal user (see column 9, line 35 through column 10, line 10 and column 10, line 65 through column 11, line 65), column 11, lines 49-55 specifically discloses money is transferred to the user that meets the recitation of rewarding the user for sending the information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electronic commerce system of **Linehan** to integrate the concept of determining that information received from a verified user regarding a design error or bug or security flaw in a computer program is valuable, and rewarding the user for submitting the information as taught by **Torii et al**. One skilled in the art would have been lead to make such a modification because it provides a secure transaction by making sure that the user has proper right of receiving the money, and also a fair transaction by allowing both parties such as the consumer and the software provider to benefit from the transaction. For instance, in a software transaction distribution system, the provider benefits from the report of design errors in the software from the consumer because the provider or merchant can take measures so that the software can be repaired and the software can be subsequently made free or error for distribution and at the same time, the user can receive refund in form of money for reporting the defect in the software as suggested by **Torii et al** or

Art Unit: 2136

free updated version for reporting the defect in the software (see column 1, line 51 through column 2, line 22).

As per claims 2 and 9, Linehan suggests using pre-authorization to prevent delay. Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to register and transfer the first security information only if security information is new so as to reduce overhead (column 9, lines 2-16).

As per claims 3 and 10, Linehan discloses a registration authority and certificate authority to register issue and authorize requestor's identity and services and certificates that a requestor is authorized to use that meets the recitation of using a classification unit for classifying and registering (column 2, lines 52-61).

Linehan discloses transferring security information after authentication that meets the recitation of transfers the security information to the second terminal only if the classification information and classification result of said classification unit coincide, for example (see column 7, lines 20-67).

As per claims 4 and 11, Linehan discloses receiving validation information and confirmation message that meets the recitation of wherein said receiving unit receives invalidity information showing invalidity of the security information from said information recipient's terminal, and said second transfer unit transfers the invalidity information to the first terminal, for example (see column 13, lines 30-61 and column 15, lines 59-67).

As per claims 5, 7, 12, and 14, Linehan substantially teaches ways of showing proof if there is a dispute (column 4, lines 45) and discloses that the gateway should implement replay direction to handle error retries (column 10, lines 40-41) that meets the recitation of sending receiving correction information as a measure of validation.

As per claims 6 and 13, Linehan discloses the bank passing information to the issuer gateway as discussed above that meets the recitation of further comprising a disclosing unit which discloses the security information registered by said registering unit and the correction information, for example (column 10, lines 40-42; column 4, lines 9-22).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as the art discloses purchase of software in a distribution system that includes rewarding a consumer for reporting design error or bug.

US Patents: 6,327,617 Fawcett; 5,835,911 Nakagawa et al; 5,889,942 Orenshteyn.

4.1 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carl Colin whose telephone number is 571-272-3862. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00-6:30 PM.


Art Unit: 2136

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cc

Carl Colin
Patent Examiner
March 20, 2006


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100